

the people of his province. This ought not to be forgotten in the sequence of events. He said:

Tonight I want to talk to you about our new oil policy in Saskatchewan. Before I do, let me first say that the Saskatchewan government approves most of the moves toward a national energy policy announced last week by the federal government.

We support extension of the oil pipeline to Montreal and other efforts to make Canada self-sufficient in oil. We support the announced intention to set up a national oil corporation to help find and develop new Canadian oil and gas. We support the intent of the federal government to hold down the price for Canadian consumers of western Canadian crude.

He went on to say they did not accept the method in which export tax funds will be handled. Therefore, on many economic and social issues there is room for accommodation. I usually enjoy cartoons, but the kind of petty and ridiculous cartoon that appeared in tonight's *Ottawa Citizen* will not in any way, shape or form help to resolve this question.

● (2030)

The minister, in his answers, referred to the export tax. However, he did not clear the air in relation to the way in which the money would be turned back to the province. I believe that if he were to clear this matter up, accommodation would be far easier.

I support without hesitation the principle followed and the action taken by the government of Saskatchewan. A government of Saskatchewan is saying once and for all that a non-renewable resource is a public utility which cannot be misused by multinational corporation but has to be used in the best interests of the people. That is a legitimate policy, the kind of program which ought to be considered by other provinces and by any national government, regardless of party.

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, listening to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight), I found myself wondering whether we were in the House of Commons or in the Saskatchewan legislature.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cullen: I do not feel it is the role of a federal member of parliament to attempt to defend a policy introduced in a provincial legislature. I thought we were supposed to be talking tonight about a federal bill.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): A two-policy party!

Mr. Cullen: It would seem to me that if the action taken by the premier and government of Saskatchewan is as good as the hon. member would have us believe, the premier and his supporters are the ones best suited to put that message across not only in their own province but throughout Canada. They do not appear to have got through to the *Ottawa Citizen*—

An hon. Member: They were wrong about medicare, too.

Mr. Cullen: I don't know if it is a good policy as far as Saskatchewan is concerned, but I must say it worries me, as a Canadian, because it seems to me to be another example of a tendency to balkanize this country. But

Energy Supplies Emergency Act

whether the Premier of Saskatchewan accepts a policy or not is not the point. His policy should stand on its own feet. If he agrees with our policy, he should say so loud and clear; and I believe the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Knight) should say exactly the same thing. I am concerned, because if one province begins to use the natural resources it happens to own as a means of bargaining with the federal government, what is to stop each and every province doing exactly the same thing and saying, "We shall go along with a national policy, But..." Mr. Speaker, that "but" does not fit in with my idea of a national policy.

The bill before us is a weapon the government must include in its arsenal if it is to attack energy problems. The debate on second reading has been wide-ranging, touching on all aspects and leaving it open to all hon. members to express varying points of view. But if what I have read in the press is true, and if what I have heard around the corridors is true, and if the official opposition intend to filibuster this measure as they are threatening to do, I say they are adopting an irresponsible posture, endeavouring to create a phony issue. The issue is not this bill; it is not the subject of this bill: it is, rather, the setting up of a national petroleum corporation, pricing, the construction of a pipeline from Sarnia to Montreal, the export tax, wellhead prices, the ownership of resources including those discovered offshore, the distribution of windfall profits, exploration, and so on. To filibuster this bill is to adopt a posture beneath the dignity of what one would expect from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

When I spoke of an opposition filibuster I heard voices from across the way telling me to sit down. I gather that no one on this side of the House is supposed to participate; we are not supposed to attack the opposition. This afternoon the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Bawden) spoke, and the hon. member for Hamilton Mountain (Mr. Beattie) wanted to speak after him because he had other responsibilities to meet tonight. I do not fault him for that. Many members of parliament have similar engagements, so we had no objection to letting a second Conservative member speak. We wanted to be reasonable. But there comes a point at which government supporters have to stand up and let it be known they are proud of a policy to which they made a substantial contribution, and proud of the minister who currently bears such a heavy responsibility.

The tragedy about a filibuster at this time is that it may very well deprive the federal government of the authority it will need to cope with an emergency situation in the future. If the opposition filibuster this bill, they may well endanger the people in the eastern part of the country whom the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) says he is endeavouring to protect, if we are to believe press releases coming out of Halifax today.

There may never be a necessity to allocate supplies on a national scale. I hope it will not be necessary. However, my information is that some degree of allocation is already taking place and that the corporations are themselves deciding who shall get supplies as gas stations find they do not have enough to meet the demands of their customers. It seems to me that if there is to be allocation, it is the